

Remarks

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for participating in the Examiner Interview with the Applicants' representative on August 28, 2007. The amendments shown above and discussed below were the topic of the Examiner Interview.

Claims 1-149 are currently pending. Claims 6, 7, 9-65, 71-94, 98-107, 109-128, 131-147, and 149 are allowed, while claims 1-5, 8, 66-70, 95-97, 108, 129, 130, and 148 stand rejected. The Applicants herein amend claims 1, 95, 129, and 148. No claims have been cancelled or added. Thus, claims 1-149 remain pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 8, 66-70, 95-97, 108, 129, 130, and 148 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,933,498 by Schneck et al. ("Schneck") and US Patent No. 6,163,859 by Lee et al. ("Lee"). The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5, 8, 66-70, 95-97, 108, 129, 130, and 148 are patentable over the combination of Schneck and Lee. Independent claims 1, 95, 129, and 148 are herein amended, support for which may be found at least on page 5, line 27 – page 6, line 6, of the originally-filed specification.

Amended claim 1 recites a data security maintenance method. The method includes "creating a package associated with a vault, the package comprising data bundled together with one or more permissions for regulating use of the data, the one or more permissions comprising one or more usage rules." The method further includes a provision of "a receiver for processing the package and storing the data in the vault, the vault being dedicated hard drive space whose existence and contents are invisible to a user." Additionally, claim 1 recites that "the existence and contents of the hard drive space are invisible to the user by an assignment of false file names and locations as seen by the user."

Amended claims 95, 129, and 148 include similar components in the form of a system, a computer program product, and a system, respectively.

Neither Schneck nor Lee, considered alone or in combination, teach at least the feature of "the vault being dedicated hard drive space whose existence and contents are invisible to a user, wherein the existence and contents of the hard drive space are invisible to the user by an assignment of false file names and locations as seen by the user," as recited in claims 1, 95, 129, and 148.

Schneck teaches controlling access to a data memory location. An access mechanism excludes "any unknown access by a user" and discovers "any such attempt at user access to the components or their contents" of the access mechanism (Schneck, column 15, lines 51-54). As acknowledged in the Office Action, "Schneck does not teach a vault comprising dedicated hard drive space or a package associated with a vault" (Office Action of July 24, 2007, page 4). Moreover, Schneck also does not teach a "vault being dedicated hard drive space whose existence and contents are invisible to a user, wherein the existence and contents of the hard drive space are invisible to the user by an assignment of false file names and locations as seen by the user," as recited in independent claims 1, 95, 129, and 148. Instead, Schneck teaches that tamper detection is employed "to ensure that all internal data (both the system's data and any user data) are destroyed before any tamperer can obtain them" (Schneck, column 16, lines 16-19). Thus, rather than making hard drive space invisible to the user, Schneck teaches erasing the memory and destroying the data (Schneck, column 16, lines 54-59).

Lee is directed to an archival vault for archiving an application. Lee, in column 4, lines 44-46, discloses that indices to a client vault are provided by metadata and that the vault "stores unique instances of software components locally to the client." However, there is no disclosure in Lee of "the vault being dedicated" or "the existence and contents of the hard drive space" being "invisible to the user by an assignment of false file names and locations as seen by the user."

The Applicants respectfully submit that the above differences set forth with respect to the combination of Schneck and Lee are such that Schneck and Lee fail to result in a method, system, and computer program product that contain each and every claimed aspect of the subject matter recited in claims 1-149. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-149 are allowable over Schneck and Lee.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-149 are now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

-DRAFT-
Paul A. Taufer
Reg. No. 35,703
Attorney for Applicants

PAT/EEP
(215) 656-3385